

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 265 818

HE 019 073

TITLE Academic and Career Advising. Academic Challenges.
INSTITUTION California State Univ., Long Beach. Office of the
Chancellor.
PUB DATE [86]
NOTE 44p.; Document printed in colored ink.
AVAILABLE FROM California State University, Office of the
Chancellor, Academic Program Improvement, 400 Golden
Shore, Long Beach, CA 90802-4275.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Advising; Academic Persistence; *Career
Counseling; College Students; *Faculty Advisers;
Faculty Development; Grants; Higher Education; Needs
Assessment; Program Administration; Program
Evaluation; Rewards; *State Universities
IDENTIFIERS *California State University

ABSTRACT

The status of student advisement services in the California State University (CSU) was assessed, and recent improvement efforts were evaluated. A total of 29 grant programs in academic and career advising funded between 1978 and 1981 were covered, along with systemwide workshops, a resource grants program, and dissemination efforts. It was found that advisement services at CSU have become more visible and integrated as a result of the grant competition, and faculty training and career advising were particularly benefited. The projects were successful in developing systemwide models for faculty training, staff development, career advising, and (indirectly) student retention, and in stimulating the production of scores of advising materials and aids. The following recommendations were offered: (1) student academic and career advising should be a campus and faculty responsibility, although other groups play a supportive role; (2) attention should be directed to faculty reward structures for advising, and expanded use of modern information technology for service delivery and analytic planning; and (3) all forms of advising could benefit from greater focus on the technical, political, and resources requirements attending program management. The titles of the grants, the campus, project director, and amount are listed. (SW)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ACADEMIC CHALLENGES

Academic and Career Advising

ED265818

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Calif State

Univ

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

PROJECT DIRECTORS

Bray, Donald W. Los Angeles	Gerlach, Margaret Long Beach	Seashore, Marjorie San Francisco
Casanova, Joseph Los Angeles	Hart, Garry Dominguez Hills	Shurtleff, Sam Chico
Castro, Donald S. Pomona	Hayes, William Stanislaus	Standing, G. Robert Chico
Cohen, David Bakersfield	Hilpert, Fred Stanislaus	Tapper, Susan San Francisco
Edmondson, Betty V. Long Beach	Kaiser, Kathleen Chico	Toohy, D. Margaret Long Beach
Erskine, Janice Humboldt	LePard, Charles Long Beach	Walter, Lowell San Jose
Feldman, Louis Stanislaus	Massey, Eric Long Beach	Warren, Lynda W. San Bernardino
Franz, Margaret-Mary Hayward	Newlin, Stephen Chico	Whitaker, Urban San Francisco
Gannon, Catherine San Bernardino	Reyes, Albert R. San Francisco	Yockey, Jamie Stanislaus
George, James H. Bakersfield	Schwartz, Florence San Francisco	

Linda Bunnell Jones
State University Dean
Academic Program Improvement

Jane Prather
Project Coordinator
Academic Program Improvement

Jane Winstead Cox
Project Assistant

Text by Stephen Daigle
Graphic Design by Marguerite Wobschall

BEST COPY AVAILABLE
3

Table of Contents

	<i>Page</i>
Introduction	1
Advising in the CSU: Background and Trends	4
Project Assessments	12
Conclusions and Recommendations	24

Introduction

This report attempts to assess the status of student advisement services in the California State University and to evaluate recent efforts designed to improve those services.

Specifically, analysis is presented of 29 grant programs in academic and career advising funded by Academic Program Improvement from 1978 through 1981. Systemwide workshops, a resource grants program, and dissemination efforts were also part of the four-year advising initiative.

The following sections:

1. offer a perspective on the status of current advising services in the CSU, and point to some of the critical gaps in policy development;
2. summarize the major findings from the 29 grant projects, and identify those which offer the greatest potential for improving advisement services generally in the system;
3. present a series of recommendations which could serve to orient policy decisions in advisement, as well as reform advising structures and delivery systems.

Table 1 provides an overview of recent efforts by the Office of the Chancellor to stimulate interest in and improve the delivery of advising services in the system. The list is highly selective in the sense that it includes activities sponsored only by the Division of Academic Program Improvement; addition of activities sponsored by other divisions of the Chancellor's Office, by individual campuses, by the Statewide Academic Senate, and others would indicate even greater levels of attention to the problem systemwide. Still, it is apparent that among the wide array of instructionally related concerns in the system requiring innovative approaches, advisement has received a strong and consistent dose of support in recent years. The activities listed in Table 1 have involved hundreds of faculty, students, staff, and administrators in attempts to improve advising services at a total cost of more than \$200,000.

Table 1
Advising Activities Sponsored by Academic
Program Improvement
1977-1981

Spring 1977	Systemwide Survey of Advising Structures, Procedures, and Policies
1978-1979	Eight Small Grants Awarded for Improving Academic Advising
Fall 1979	First Systemwide Workshop on Advising
1978-1981	Multi-Campus Maxi-Grant on Career Advising Awarded for Three Semesters
1979-1981	Twenty Small Grants Awarded for Improving Advising
Spring 1980	Twenty-nine Resource Grants Awarded
Fall 1980	Second Systemwide Workshop on Advising
Spring 1981	Two Systemwide Dissemination Conferences on Advising

Here is a brief overview of the major findings and recommendations which follow:

Findings:

1. Advisement services in the CSU have become more visible and integrated as a result of the grant competition; faculty training and career advising were particularly benefited.
2. The projects were successful in developing systemwide models for faculty training, staff development, career advising, and (indirectly) student retention, and in stimulating the production of scores of advising materials and aids.

Recommendations:

1. Student academic and career advising should be treated primarily as a campus and faculty responsibility, although many other groups must play an important supportive role in achieving an integrated approach.
2. Two critical areas deserving immediate attention are faculty reward structures for advising, and expanded use of modern information technology for service delivery and analytic planning.

-
3. Attempts to link either student development models or student retention strategies to advising structures and services should be abandoned as costly and unworkable, unless applied under very narrow and specialized circumstances.
 4. All forms of advising could benefit from greater attention to the technical, political, and resource requirements attending program management.

It is important to note that these remarks concentrate on overall project outcomes and implications; given the number and scope of the projects being reviewed, detailed descriptions of their specific objectives and procedures are not practical and are secondary concerns in any case. The major intent is to draw some broad lessons about advising from the campus projects generally and to systematically convey those findings to students, faculty, and administrators systemwide.

It should also be noted that the projects covered in this report do not include several specialized advising grants, programs, and services in the CSU intended primarily to address the needs of women and ethnic minority students. These efforts will be the focus of a later publication in the "Academic Challenges" series.

Advising in the CSU: Background and Trends

For too long, academic advising has been viewed as a rather mundane faculty activity of assisting students in scheduling courses and meeting graduation requirements. Neither the status nor rewards of such advising has ever been very high. As a result, academic advising for decades has been perceived as a rather unpleasant duty which was seldom delivered in a systematic or comprehensive fashion.

More recently, the advising structures and procedures in the system have become more ambitious. The process now includes career and personal counseling, involves a wider range of university personnel, and requires more sophisticated modes of information storage and retrieval.

Several factors contributed to this new emphasis on academic advising. Reforms in general education required mechanisms for informing students about the changes in degree requirements. Growing pools of undeclared majors leave thousands of students "homeless"—i.e., without a departmental advisor. Minority, part-time, adult, and other non-traditional students often have academic problems which are not easily addressed through traditional advising channels. Declining enrollments on some campuses have focused attention on advising as one approach to increasing retention rates, and computer technology promises to revolutionize the process of record-keeping and performance monitoring. Given such trends, academic advising has assumed a more complex meaning and a more prominent role both for faculty and student affairs personnel.

However, there are a number of conceptual and practical problems which may be endemic to delivering advising services and which continue to plague efforts to reform them. Some of the major ones include:

1. *Definition*—It is seldom clear what student advisement can or should entail, either legally or ethically. Traditional models tend to emphasize purely academic concerns of degree and

course choices, registration and course scheduling, general education and graduation requirements, tutorial assistance, and the like. More recent student development models argue that exploration of life and vocational goals must be included to provide a total and integrated educational experience; cognitive, affective, and social dimensions of the student's personality are considered legitimate topics of advising since all are ultimately related to academic decisions and performance. While few would challenge the underline logic or fault the humanistic appeal of the latter approach, it presents serious difficulties in terms of resources, organization, and measurement. In any event, there is little agreement among faculty, academic administrators, and student affairs personnel over the conceptual boundaries of student advising.

2. *Organizational Structure*—The historic tension between academic advisors (primarily faculty) and career and psychological counselors is often manifested in organizational divisions. General coordinating centers for academic advisement usually report to the Vice President for Academic Affairs; career planning and personal counseling are usually housed in student services. Attempts to achieve greater integration of these services have been only partially successful at best.
3. *Logistics and Information*—The sheer numbers and turnover of students seeking advising assistance presents serious logistical problems of space, personnel, paper flow, and record-keeping. Even in an era of heightened interest and status, advisement and counseling centers are often overwhelmed by the volume of work. Given the essentially interpersonal nature of most advising activities, little progress has been made in devising more efficient delivery systems or more technically sophisticated information systems.
4. *Policy Guidelines*—Few campuses in the CSU or elsewhere have formal policy statements governing the areas of responsibility for advising and procedures for resource allocation. The rights of students (particularly those with special needs) are not consistently defined in the system, and the responsibilities of faculty are only indirectly addressed through rather mechanistic workload formulas. Nowhere has the question of faculty reward for advising been adequately answered.

There is currently no comprehensive systemwide policy governing academic advisement in the CSU. Rather, there are

only general workload provisions of weighted teaching units equivalencies and assigned time for full-time faculty.

Still, it is known that most individual campuses have adopted academic advising practices which are more specific than the systemwide workload provisions. Faculty handbooks often identify responsibilities of all faculty in maintaining office hours and advising students; other advising responsibilities, particularly of part-time faculty, tend to be addressed through informal understandings on a departmental basis. Although relatively few appear to have well-developed policy statements clearly delineating the advising responsibilities of faculty and administrators, the following advising patterns are fairly common:

1. *Organizational Status*—Many campuses distinguish between formal and operational responsibility for academic advising, although on every campus responsibility for providing academic advisement to students with declared majors rests ultimately with regular departmental faculty. Counseling centers and central advising offices usually handle advising for general education and undeclared and special majors.
2. *Resource Allocation*—Few patterns are evident in the number of positions allocated for administration and coordination of academic advisement among the campuses. Procedurally, there is a tendency for professional programs (e.g., Business and Engineering) to centralize the advising process at the school level; otherwise, faculty responsibilities in advising are assigned by their respective departments.
3. *Special Problems*—Few campuses had solved the problem of advising for part-time and evening students, or of defining the advising responsibilities of part-time faculty. Again, there is no systemwide workload provision for advising among part-time faculty, many of whom teach in professional programs with high numbers of majors, such as computer science and business.

Advisement in the CSU is characterized, therefore, by the following conditions:

- A general lack of systemwide or campus policy statements clearly defining the nature, scope, and responsibilities of advising services to students;
- Wide diversity among the 19 campuses in advising structures, procedures, and resource commitments;

-
- A generalized sense of dissatisfaction with advisement delivery systems, particularly in regard to special student populations;
 - A differentiation of advising responsibilities between coordinating centers and departmental faculty, with the latter focusing almost exclusively on declared majors;
 - Continued territorial divisions among academic, career, and personal counselors.

On the other hand, some positive changes have occurred (particularly since 1978) due in part to the advising grants, the systemwide advising workshops, the resource grants program, and other dissemination efforts sponsored by the Chancellor's Office and individual campuses. Several sources of evidence indicate that the advising problem has achieved greater visibility and usually a higher priority on most campuses. Career advising has greater respectability, and traditional organizational divisions between faculty and counselors have been weakened. And the system has at its disposal scores of tangible products and tested conceptual models for improving almost every facet of the advising process, particularly faculty training and career advising.

Perhaps the most disconcerting note of the past several years has been the convenient linking of advising with student retention. Much of the recent interest in advisement was a direct result of enrollment declines in the late 1970's. Improvement of the advising process seemed like a natural solution to many. This may have had the unfortunate consequence of raising expectations about advising outcomes to levels far beyond those which could be realistically produced. Current evidence suggests that advisement needs a legitimizing framework that is both less sweeping than the student development model and less demanding than student retention.

Current evidence suggests that advisement needs a legitimizing framework that is both less sweeping than the student development model and less demanding than student retention.

Perhaps the chief trend in planning and organizing advisement services has been a movement toward greater differentiation of

delivery systems and target populations. Increasingly, traditional faculty advising is supplemented by professional and para-professional counselors, student peer advisors, advisement centers, printed materials and outreach efforts, and computers. Although advising remains a relatively passive activity from the standpoint of delivery strategies, considerable interest has been generated for more proactive approaches such as "intrusive" counseling and mandatory advisement.

All evidence suggests that the CSU system and higher education generally is becoming more diversified in the composition of its student population. Advisement structures geared to serving a residential, predominately white, 18 to 24 year old, full-time clientele is increasingly inappropriate for the current decade or beyond. Older adults, commuters, women, minorities, undeclared majors, transfer students, evening and part-time students, disadvantaged and handicapped students, and high-risk students are among the target groups which have received greater attention recently, although new freshmen and declared majors are still the dominate populations of concern.

Some of the advising grants under review here were able to break new ground of a conceptual, organizational, technical, or policy nature. Still others offer some innovative approaches for addressing the needs of special clientele, and a few comprehensive models were developed for implementing faculty training, staff development, and career advising programs. Yet, many of the broader, and largely endemic problems, associated with advising remain unresolved at both the campus and system levels.

The development of advising programs to meet the needs of individual campuses was one of several priority areas in the 1978-1981 API grant competition. Campus proposals contained a statement of need; a description of the project in terms of activities, objectives, outcomes, timeline, numbers of students and faculty involved, and an indication about the ways in which the project relates to past or future campus plans to improve advising; a statement of the means by which the campus would continue the project; and a statement about the project director's experience in advising or qualifications for leadership of the project. Final reports were required of all funded projects, with the understanding that an external evaluator might suggest additional reporting and data collection requirements. Tangible evidence of campus support for the proposal also was required in addition to formal endorsement or approval of the project.

All proposals were forwarded with campus recommendations to a review panel designated for the subject area. The panels were composed of CSU faculty, students, and administrators selected for their experience and expertise in student advising. The panelists did not know the names of the campuses submitting the proposals. The recommendations of the panels were forwarded to the API Advisory Committee which made final recommendations to the Chancellor.

Tables 2 and 3 offer summaries of the advising grants for 1978-79, and 1979-81. The project director, campus, grant amount, and project title are shown.

Table 2
API Grants to Improve Academic Advising
1978-1979

Project Director	Campus	Grant	Project Title
James H. George	Bakersfield	\$4,800	Seminar on Faculty and Career Counseling
Janice Erskine	Humboldt	4,264	Advising Undeclared Majors
Lowell Walter	San Jose	2,100	Evaluating Advising Services to Students Who Have Been Academically Disqualified
David Cohen	Bakersfield	2,296	Advising for Evaluation of Experiential Prior Learning
William Hayes	Stanislaus	4,155	Training for Faculty Advisors
Garry Hart	Dominguez Hills	4,000	General Education Advisement Training Program
Catherine Gannon	San Bernardino	4,281	Pre-Enrollment Screening of Freshmen Files
Marjorie Seashore	San Francisco	2,650	Improving the Quality of Academic Advising in the Sociology Department

Table 3
API Grants to Improve Academic Advising
1979-1981

Project Director	Campus	Grant	Project Title
Kathleen Kaiser	Chico	\$5,000	Faculty Peer Advising Teams
G. Robert Standing	Chico	3,450	Strengthening Academic Advising Within Departments
Margaret-Mary Franz	Hayward	5,003	Major Selection Advisement
Margaret Gerlach	Long Beach	2,000	Training Materials for Liberal Arts Faculty Advisors
D. Margaret Toohey Betty V. Edmondson	Long Beach	2,500	Non-Traditional Career Curricula for Students in Physical Education
Eric Massey Chuck LePard	Long Beach	3,000	Introduction to the Academic Experience
Eric Massey Chuck LePard	Long Beach	4,512	Department Advisory Assistants
Joseph Casanova	Los Angeles	2,950	Faculty Advisor Recognition
Donald W. Bray	Los Angeles	4,237	Special Advisement for Latin American Students
Donald S. Castro	Pomona	2,950	Faculty Advising Handbook
Lynda W. Warren	San Bernardino	4,263	Staff Training
Albert R. Reyes	San Francisco	4,608	Advising for the Academically Deficient Student
Susan Tapper Florence Schwartz	San Francisco	4,647	Department Advising Models
Urban Whitaker	San Francisco	5,000	Business-Related Career Skills for Liberal Arts Students
Lowell Walter	San Jose	4,897	Reducing Attrition Among Students During Summer Break
Louis Feldman	Stanislaus	4,807	Outreach Advising for Part-Time and Evening Students
Jamie Yockey Fred Hilpert	Stanislaus	3,907	Human Relations Training for Department Secretaries

Twelve of the 19 campuses received at least one advising grant in the competition, with San Francisco and Long Beach receiving four each. Eleven of the 29 grants (including the Chico maxi-grant) were sponsored by faculty in academic departments, and 18 were sponsored by directors of academic advisement centers or academic administrators.

Project Assessments

The advising grants cut across a broad spectrum of approaches, target audiences, products, and substantive concerns. Faculty training, staff development, career advising, and student retention formed the four major divisions of grant activity, and this section summarizes those activities. The advising needs of undeclared majors, probationary students, disqualified students, non-traditional students, and liberal arts majors received the greatest amount of attention. Survey, experimental, aggregate, and qualitative data were collected to support most grant activities. General education, peer advising, experiential learning, faculty rewards, advising handbooks, and career information were incorporated into many of the projects. In general, few major areas of interest were omitted from the grants; in that sense, the selection process accurately reflected most of the systemwide problems and reform efforts in academic and career advisement. The only important areas which failed to receive any attention in the projects were computer-assisted advising and personal counseling, although some would consider these specialized or peripheral concerns in any case.

Faculty Training

Twelve of the 29 projects (41%) were concerned primarily with some aspect of faculty training and academic advisement. This total does not include another five projects which focused almost exclusively on faculty training in career advising. Obviously, faculty were perceived as being the most important element in the advising equation, and motivational and training workshops were the dominant modes of generating interest and involvement. Of the twelve projects being reviewed here, a great deal of variation is apparent in terms of the specific forms which the training took. Three produced advising handbooks, although they varied widely in scope and content. One emphasized training in general education, another stressed the use of peer advisors, while two others focused on the advising needs of undeclared majors. One used financial rewards and recognition as a means of inducing faculty involvement in advising, and the remaining projects were rather standard training efforts, although a couple were very comprehensive in scope. Clearly, the most

successful projects of this nature were the ones which received strong support from department chairs and which used the academic department as the chief mode of organization and means of communication.

Obviously, faculty were perceived as being the most important element in the advising equation, and motivational and training workshops were the dominant modes of generating interest and involvement.

Among the advising handbooks, two are strongly recommended for systemwide attention. The publication by Massey and LePard, "Introduction to the Academic Experience," is a very practical, nuts-and-bolts attempt to make sense of the University catalog for faculty and students alike. The faculty advising handbook at Pomona, developed by the dean of undergraduate studies, is a very comprehensive effort to provide information on academic procedures and regulations; it is revised annually.

Two points should be noted by other campuses which attempt to produce such handbooks. First, campuses without deans of undergraduate studies may find it difficult to find someone with the knowledge, skills, and authority (and time) to coordinate the gathering of information, handbook preparation, printing, distribution, etc. Second, it can be a fairly costly effort if done yearly, given the requirements of supplies, student assistants, and an administrative coordinator.

Among the products from the Kaiser grant were three videotapes of training sessions for peer-faculty advisor teams in the social and behavioral sciences. Ironically, the major contribution of the grant may have been to provide an exhaustive litany of the problems inherent in implementing peer advising systems. The Massey and LePard project is also instructive in this regard.

The training projects by Hart and George were fairly similar, although the former emphasized technical, general education advising and the latter concentrated on career skills. Both were well organized, favorably evaluated by the participants, and offered a wide array of excellent workshop materials and activities—data analysis, skill development, resource identification, tests, surveys, assessment inventories, and the like.

Coordinators of faculty training workshops should consider adopting some of them.

The evaluation design in the Hart project was carefully conceived, and he was able to provide some good evaluative data. The evaluation component of the George grant was less convincing, but the project did stimulate the development of 12 sections of a mandatory orientation course for new freshmen with a strong career advising emphasis. As general faculty training devices, through the use of advising workshops, both projects have something other campuses could find useful.

Finally, the projects by Standing, Franz, and Tapper and Schwartz, are among the most instructive of all the grants since they address two important and related issues—the role of academic departments in advising, and the motivation and training of faculty.

Extensive faculty (especially department chair) support and involvement characterized the Standing project. Institutional support was also obtained; the political groundwork was carefully laid. The project represented a judicious, systematic, and comprehensive attempt to structure a departmental advising system that is effective and self-sustaining. The project also generated many useful modes of data collection instruments and workshop activities. It was properly evaluated and disseminated. Indications were that training in the sources and uses of data about majors was excellent. It is probably the best systemwide model on departmental advising.

However, there are two reservations about the Standing project. First, the project required assistance from a very strong and able office of Institutional Research; several campuses in the system may find that they are not able to fully satisfy the heavy data collection demands of the model. Second, a great deal of cooperation was required from Admissions and Records, Advisement Centers, and Career Placement. Campuses with political and organizational structures different from Chico may encounter more problems. The lessons of this project, then, are identical to those of Warren, Phillips and Seashore, and Franz—*effective advising is essentially a departmental and faculty responsibility, requires strong administrative leadership and support, an adequate information system, and good political and organizational linkages.*

The Franz grant, too, attracted outstanding departmental commitment and involvement. Forty of 43 academic departments were represented, which included 65 degree programs. The project was well organized and carefully implemented. A particularly attractive aspect of the model is that it sets in motion a permanent network of departmentally based advisors for undeclared majors and provides printed information for such students.

Perhaps the major contribution of the Tapper and Schwartz project was to advance an important conceptual idea; namely, that no one departmental advising model is appropriate for all departments, but that it is possible to draw upon the general skills and techniques developed in one department to assist advising in another. For example, the Standing model is comprehensive enough to accommodate many diverse disciplines. Otherwise, the Tapper and Schwartz project generated a great deal of activity, along with the inevitable problems of coordination and evaluation. The project did show that mandatory advising may cause more problems than it solves since most students simply ignore the requirement. There was little evidence in any of the projects that "forcing" students to declare a major had significantly positive consequences.

If one assumes that workshops are useful, then training people to be good advisors through workshops is reasonable. Yet, the most common complaint of faculty in almost all of the workshop projects was on the need for more printed training materials and information. Formal training is time-consuming, expensive (averaging about \$100 per participant), short term, and perhaps largely unnecessary for individuals accustomed to teaching themselves. At any rate, the most common remarks about workshops are a) the printed materials were most useful and b) more or even most of the workshops should have been condensed and presented in printed form.

Staff Development

Two projects identified staff development as one important but generally neglected aspect of the advisement process. A series of slides, tapes, workbooks, questionnaires, and other materials were developed by these projects.

The Warren project was excellent in all respects—the exercises, materials, evaluation data, information base, political adroitness. Two workshops were held to develop an advising information base for staff and to train staff in inter-personal skills. The project

reflected the kind of structure usually reserved for larger grant programs, complete with a needs assessment component, a steering committee, comprehensive survey instruments, and excellent workshop exercises and materials. It deserves to be widely disseminated in the system, and selected products from the project are available for replication.

Career Advising

Four of the seven projects in this category addressed career-related problems in the social and behavioral sciences (liberal arts). With the exceptions of the Chico maxi-grant and the Phillips and Seashore project, this category offers little that could be easily replicated elsewhere. However, a couple of points are worth noting. The general lessons of the Gerlach project were to indicate the serial nature of career paths and the immense diversity of paths available to liberal arts majors. These ideas have already enjoyed wide dissemination in the system. The Whitaker project developed worksheets and slide/tape presentations for teaching career values and transferable job skills to liberal arts majors. In a sense, the project offered one means for disseminating many of the ideas contained in the Chico maxi-grant.

The Phillips and Seashore handbook is a fine example of what any department can and should do for itself. They made ample use of national data on careers in their major (sociology), and drew explicit linkages between courses and jobs. The handbook offers a wealth of primary (survey) and secondary data on job trends, needed skills, and so forth, all with a disciplinary focus. Other liberal arts disciplines would do well to get a copy and emulate its structure.

The Chico model of career advisement easily dominates all such approaches in the system. The project sponsored six training workshops on four campuses covering 12 days between Fall 1979 and Fall 1980. It attracted approximately 150 faculty, administrative, and staff participants. Given its scope and format, the project has been systematically evaluated on four separate occasions, and it deserves extended comment here.

The Chico model of career advisement easily dominates all such approaches in the system.

The Chico campus had been involved for several years in developing comprehensive career advising programs for students in the social and behavioral sciences. As economic conditions changed and the employment prospects for such majors became less certain, the need for even greater attention to the problem became more apparent. Accordingly, the Chico directors contracted with six (and later five additional) campuses to offer a series of training workshops on career advising for interested faculty and career counselors. Regional workshops were held in Fall 1979, Spring 1980, and Fall 1980 over a total of 12 days. The major concern of the training was to present information, ideas, and practical strategies which would promote an integration of career considerations with traditional academic advising.

Like most workshops, these attracted the interested but marginally informed; they heightened the participants' awareness of and concern about the problem of career advising for liberal arts majors; they provided an important conceptual idea (program diversification) as well as practical strategies (internships, market data, handbooks), and served as an organizational and communication vehicle for the participants on several campuses and across several disciplines. Despite the considerable logistical burden which all this implies, the projects were efficiently administered and favorably received.

In addition to these positive contributions, the sessions: 1) addressed a practical and immediate problem confronting thousands of social science majors in the system; 2) managed to attract a fair number of representatives from all participating campuses; 3) implemented most of the planned activities of the projects and successfully provided most of the workshop products. All of the workshops were very favorably evaluated by the participants. The project was also successful in focusing the beginnings of communications linkages between faculty and counselors. Finally, project directors proved flexible enough to continually revise the format and even content of the workshops to better serve the perceived needs of the audiences.

The ideas, products, and training of the workshops stressed the "practical" aspects of career advising for students in the social and behavior sciences; it was precisely this aspect of the projects which facilitated grant objectives of institutionalization, dissemination, and transportability. Yet this approach also tended to restrict consideration of broader conceptual (and perhaps even philosophical) matters. At issue is not whether students in the liberal arts find jobs, but the ultimate value of higher education. This is a far more complex idea to implement in terms of

planning concrete advising programs, and it probably did not receive the attention it deserves.

For example, development of liberal arts skills not only helps one find and do well at a job; they are even more important in non-career related experiences. Students need to be taught how to weigh the relative priorities of career, family, emotional health, and the like, and how to understand the relationships among them. In that sense, the Chico model of career advising may have been too narrowly conceived. The real value of a liberal arts education may forever be embedded in more important life endeavors than careers. The conceptual focus of the project was very broad in terms of the disciplines represented, but fairly narrow and concrete in terms of the ideas developed.

On the other hand, an early evaluation of the project urged more nuts-and-bolts training as one means of stimulating greater behavioral commitment among the participants. Most of the earlier workshop responses suggested a sense of "drift" among the participants, although almost everyone felt motivated and better informed. The later workshop sessions were structured more toward practical planning and implementation strategies, so it may be unfair to question why other things were not done.

Finally, while evaluation responses indicated that the participants clearly appreciated the importance of program diversification (e.g., double minors) and internships, one dimension of the Chico model received little mention—namely, student skill development, particularly communications skills. Given the close substantive linkages between the liberal arts and such skills, their role in career development probably should have received greater emphasis.

An informal survey of coordinators of career advising on the original seven campuses indicated a wide range of effects flowing, either directly or indirectly, from the workshop training. While many of the outcomes were of a generalized nature (e.g., greater faculty interest in career advising), several more specific activities could also be identified. Here is a list of the types of effects which the coordinators identified for their campus:

Activity	Number of Campuses Cited
Alumni Surveys	2
Career-Related Courses	3
Career-Related Publications	6
Career Days	3
Internships	1
Departmental—CPP Liaison	1
Departmental Career Advisors	3
Outreach	1
Grant Proposals	1
General Publicity	3

While this list does suggest a great deal of career advising activity among the seven schools of social and behavioral sciences, a couple of questions should be considered. It is not apparent how many of these were "new" activities (i.e., occurred after the workshop training); career days, publications, courses, publicity, etc., are fairly common occurrences and may have been "in motion" before the workshops. Second, if these were entirely new programs, some may have occurred without campus participation in the workshops; the fact that they followed the training does not necessarily mean they were caused by it. But perhaps that is not really the point. The scope of activities itself is impressive, whatever their precise origin, and attests to the interest in career advising among the original campuses. These do not appear to be transient efforts; rather, they are suggestive of instructionalized outcomes beyond the immediate and short-term effects of the workshops.

The outcomes clearly reflect most of the major concerns expressed by the project directors. The career courses and network of departmental career advisors indicate that more faculty have both recognized the importance of such advising to their majors and are taking steps to address this need. Indications are that greater contact has been achieved between faculty and career planning and placement offices, although such liaison remains more informal than an organizational network. There is greater study and use of alumni as resource agents in career advising through surveys, internships, career days, outreach, and

general publicity. Finally, deans' offices on almost all of the 12 campuses have been regular participants in efforts to improve career advising, so there is always the chance of some resource commitments in the future, particularly in the form of faculty rewards. At a minimum, career advising among the participating schools has probably attained near equal status and visibility with academic advising, and some integration with the latter has been achieved.

At a minimum, career advising among the participating schools has probably attained near equal status and visibility with academic advising, and some integration with the latter has been achieved.

The directors of the project were asked to respond to several questions concerning the administration and content of the workshops, as well as the problem of career advising generally. Here are some of their major areas of agreement:

1. There is simply no substitute for leadership from the dean's office in stimulating participation in the workshops. More importantly, such offices must serve as the primary sources of faculty support if attempts to institutionalize career advising are to be successful. Many deans are eager to support the concept of career advising, but apparently do not accord it a higher priority in terms of school goals, policies, and resources.
2. Career counseling is clearly not a purely faculty or administrative responsibility, but depends on cooperation from both areas. The participation of career counselors in the workshops provided an opportunity for face-to-face exchanges with faculty, an infrequent occurrence on campus. The long-term goal must be to sustain and expand these channels of communication.
3. It is difficult to provide career advising skills, information, and motivation in one workshop. These sessions emphasized the latter two, which may not be the best approach for those already reasonably informed and motivated.
4. Organizational and political considerations may not have received the treatment they deserved in this series of

workshops. While the Chico model may be appropriate for many campuses, the questions of "who" should implement it and "when" and "how" resources are to be found were never systematically addressed.

5. The workshops did produce some tangible products (films, slides, printed materials) which could help disseminate their impact in the future.

The directors emphasized the crucial roles of the faculty, deans, and the Chancellor's Office in increasing levels of awareness and support for career advising. They suggested that academic and career advising be mandatory for faculty with tangible rewards and sanctions. They argued that career advising must be faculty-based, be linked to the academic concerns of a discipline and degree program, and be supported by the dean with assigned time or other resources.

Overall, there was little to seriously criticize about these attempts to revitalize the social and behavioral sciences. The directors were hard-working, dedicated, and competent; they managed a difficult logistical task about as well as could be expected. The project offered some important lessons about the inherent nature and problems of implementing multi-campus grants. The workshops were well received, although participation patterns were uneven. Perhaps of greatest importance, the Chico model provides a fairly comprehensive model of career advising on which to draw, adopt, and modify to individual needs. And the project generated enough publicity as well as training to stimulate, reinforce, or expand career advising efforts on several campuses.

Student Retention

Retention was mentioned as a project objective of some kind by almost everyone. The word itself probably was intended to convey a certain importance and broader sense of legitimacy to the project. In some cases, retention was defined literally as a short-term goal of the project and measured accordingly. In most others, it was actually a long-term "hope" of what might eventually result from faculty training in academic or career advising.

Among the seven projects which had an explicit retention focus, two actually were studies which served to challenge many of the presumed relationships among advising services, student interests, and retention. Another was essentially a peer advising project

which offered some valuable insights into that mode of delivering advising services as well as departmental advising, but relatively little about retention. Two others were directed at the needs of high-risk student groups, but failed to present any convincing evidence on continuation rates.

The Gannon project did attempt to measure retention rates and found some positive results. The project attempted, among other things, to reduce first-time/first-term student attrition by screening freshmen files (e.g., high school performance) as a means of building individual profiles for advising. The project also made early contact with students in academic difficulty.

The quarterly attrition rate for new freshmen was decreased from 18% to 10% among the 250 students chosen for the sample, a slight increase in grade-point average was also noted, particularly for those who availed themselves of advising services. The entire process of transcript analysis and advisement coordination has been institutionalized in an office of Freshmen Services.

Although plans have been made to computerize some of the operation, this is still a labor-intensive effort involving some highly skilled people. Development of a much larger data base with an adequate tracking system could be very costly. The manual processing of files through the grant cost about \$20 per transcript. Still, this was among the more innovative projects and the idea deserves to be refined and expanded.

An inter-campus project by Gannon and Standing was aimed at reducing student attrition among upper-division transfers. The grant sponsored eleven departmental studies of transfer majors in an attempt to acquaint faculty with the special needs and problems of transfer students. These things are noteworthy about this project. First, the department (or student major) is used as the primary unit of analysis for understanding and addressing attrition. Second, advising is treated as a problem of information flow, from the student to the department, and vice versa. Third, the project distinguished between advising information of a mechanical nature which should be delivered at the university level, and academic information which belongs at the departmental level.

Other Systemwide Activities

An advising workshop was held at the Lake Arrowhead Conference Center on November 14-16, 1979. The primary objective of the workshop was to provide CSU faculty and administrators with the motivation, training, and information for

submitting successful grant proposals for improving academic advising on their campus.

Approximately 70 individuals attended the workshop, representing all 19 campuses and the Chancellor's Office. Forty-one returned evaluation questionnaires and the data were overwhelmingly positive on almost all counts.

A second systemwide advising workshop was held October 16-17, 1980 at Kellogg-West on the Pomona campus. About 35 participants gathered to hear a national authority on academic advising present strategies for organizing advisement services.

As a result of suggestions from participants at the academic advising conference at Lake Arrowhead, competition was initiated in Spring 1980 for advising resource grants with a maximum value of \$500. They were to be used to acquire goods and services that directly enhanced the involvement of faculty in the academic advising process.

The allocations were for a one-time augmentation of existing efforts. Requests were accepted from the following areas: a) purchase of audio-visual, such as film strips, videotapes, cassette recordings, or graphics for use in faculty training or student advising; b) purchase of reference works such as those cataloging graduate school scholarships, occupational titles and outlook, or ones that help a student select a major or understand educational options and their relation to career choices; c) contracts and travel for consultants to help design or to participate in faculty training workshops.

A total of \$11,172 was awarded to 29 proposals, representing eleven campuses. Sixteen percent (\$1,732) of the funds were used for personal services, and the remainder paid for operating expenses such as printing, materials, and consultants.

Finally, in Spring 1981, two regional meetings were held for dissemination of ideas and materials from the advising projects. The invited audiences were key faculty and administrative figures from each campus who were not directly involved in the delivery of advising services, but who had some measure of policy responsibility for allocating resources for advisement (e.g., school deans, deans of undergraduate studies, chairs of faculty senate committees, etc.). The meetings were intended to publicize the project activities and to encourage adoption of similar efforts throughout the system. Selected project directors were invited to make presentations to the participants, and assistance was provided concerning implementation of some of the more successful projects.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The advising initiatives sponsored through Academic Program Improvement have served at least two important functions. First, they have produced some specific products, conceptual models, and implementation strategies which are available to all campuses in the system. Second, they have served to highlight some of the broader issues which structure the advising function. Based on these experiences, this section examines ten major "lessons" about advising that deserve systemwide attention.

1. *A Campus Responsibility*—Academic and career advising is not a problem that lends itself easily to systemwide solutions and policy directives. Given the diversity of individual campuses in terms of faculty, students, degree programs, facilities, and so forth, attempts to recommend standardized advisement structures or procedures probably would be ineffective. However, the grants projects do show that the Chancellor's Office is in a unique position for encouraging, supporting, and coordinating advisement activities in the system; it can assist campuses in improving their own organization and delivery of advisement services, recommend approaches that have proven successful elsewhere, and warn against approaches that have not been effective.

Moreover, advisement is a campus-wide responsibility; it is not the special purview of student services, advisement centers, career planning and placement offices, or faculty advisors. Rather, the faculty, administration, and staff of the university share in the responsibility of providing accurate and effective advisement to students, from resource allocation to service delivery. Coordination and integration of the advisement function remains as one of the most difficult problems facing campus administrators. Duplication of effort and waste of resources is usually inevitable unless great attempts are made to control and integrate the disparate activities of faculty advisors, advisement and counseling centers, career placement, student affirmative action programs, learning resource centers, and the like. In general, some degree of centralization appears necessary if resources, data, and services related to advisement are to be utilized most efficiently.

-
2. *A Faculty Responsibility*—Perhaps the strongest case for linking advisement to student retention concerns the role of faculty advisors as “significant others” for students. The data are clear and consistent on this point—the presence of a faculty mentor who is accessible and concerned about the student (in the broadest sense) is a major factor in recruiting and maintaining qualified majors for a department. The student already has personal, professional, and academic incentives for remaining in school; informal relationships with faculty (through orientation sessions, student clubs, office visits) build psychological and social bonds to the institution as well. Neither machines nor student peers seem to possess the advising credibility and power afforded faculty.
-

. . . advisement is a campus-wide responsibility; it is not the special purview of student services, advisement centers, career planning and placement offices, or faculty advisors.

Ironically, while faculty are often reluctant to assume advising responsibilities, they tend to resent and even vigorously oppose anyone else who attempts to do it for them. In short, there simply is no suitable alternative for faculty advising; in that sense, the emphasis accorded faculty training in the grant competition was well placed. This is not to suggest that other forms of counseling activities on a campus are irrelevant or ineffective. Rather, it does imply that without faculty support and involvement, such activities are likely to be peripheral to both the resources and academic concerns that animate university life.

The critical problem, then, becomes one of persuading faculty that academic and career advising is a legitimate role to adopt, like that of teacher or scholar, with attendant rewards and recognition. However, it may be both unrealistic and unnecessary to invoke sanctions against faculty who perform this function poorly, or not at all. Faculty whose interests and abilities lead them to adopt other role orientations can be evaluated by other criteria without causing adverse effects on the advising systems.

The advising grants were successful in generating several models of faculty advisor training. A few were particularly sophisticated in design and well implemented, in addition to having a wide base of school and departmental support. These models deserve special note and should be considered for adoption by other campuses.

The critical problem, then, becomes one of persuading faculty that academic and career advising is a legitimate role to adopt, like that of teacher or scholar, with attendant rewards and recognition.

3. *Faculty Reward*—Perhaps the most obvious and important place to begin reform of the academic advisement process is with the hiring, training, salary, promotion, and tenure of faculty advisors. Currently, advising ranks far behind other faculty duties in terms of providing direct, immediate, or tangible rewards. Teaching, research and publication, committee work, and other tasks typically account for more time and importance in faculty workload evaluations. It is rare that faculty contracts ever mention academic advising as a required duty, much less specify its nature or extent. But beyond such legal incentives, practical assistance is required to cultivate the necessary interest and skills for effective advising.

Again, the emphasis on faculty training in the advising grants was well placed. To the extent that advising has anything to do with student retention, it is almost solely through the faculty advising process. Numerous studies on student retention suggest that merely a concerned attitude toward students on the part of faculty is enough to significantly affect persistence rates. Thus, if the advising workshops did nothing more than heighten faculty awareness of and interest in student needs for a caring, significant other, they could be considered successful beyond imparting any technical information or skills.

But sensitivity and technical training is not enough to take full advantage of the faculty resource in advising. More subtle and systematic reward strategies are needed, and responsibility for developing such schemes rests primarily with department chairs, school deans, and vice presidents.

To the extent that advising has anything to do with student retention, it is almost solely through the faculty advising process.

For example, it should be *formally* recognized by a department, a school, a campus, indeed the system generally, that advising is an important function, but a specialized one. Unfortunately, most advising advocates still argue that since advising skills can be learned by almost everyone, they *should* be learned. Effective advising requires skills and personality traits that simply are not universally possessed by all faculty. It makes little sense to expect or require that everyone attempt to do everything well—be a good teacher, a productive scholar, a professional activist, a community contributor, a campus political participant, in addition to advising duties.

With the emergence of collective bargaining, faculty unions may require that some of the informal assumptions and practices of the current faculty personnel process be formally recognized. It seems to make sense, then, to adopt a more differentiated structure of faculty roles and evaluation criteria. Beyond minimal performance standards in teaching, it should be possible to assign other duties to faculty (including advising) according to individual talents and preferences. Under such conditions, qualified faculty might be expected to voluntarily choose heavier advising loads, if it were understood that such duties would be properly weighted in the personnel review process. Some CSU campuses do have an informal evaluation and reward process for faculty advisors, based at the departmental level.

In addition to reform of personnel procedures, there are less global approaches that could stimulate greater faculty involvement in student advising. School deans and department chairs have rather wide discretionary authority in several areas of resource allocation, particularly faculty

"perks." Clerical and student assistance, equipment and computer terminals, preferential class scheduling, lighter committee and teaching loads, and quality office space are among the simple, low-cost incentives that administrators might consider offering in exchange for time spent in advising students. Mandatory advising by faculty too often is used as a substitute for more innovative approaches. For example, each school at Pomona bestows an "advisor of the year" award to deserving faculty.

In general, it seems clear that both the delivery and reward systems in faculty advising should be departmentally based. Faculty identifications tend to be linked first to their disciplines and second to their departments. Advisor training, selection, and reward efforts that are far removed from the department are unlikely to stimulate faculty interest and commitment. This is particularly true of advising programs which do not have strong and direct academic ties (e.g., programs sponsored by counseling and career centers). Without sustained support from school deans and department chairs, advising can be expected to remain a minor outpost in faculty career paths.

4. *Information Technology*—An academic environment is typically oriented toward the printed word; counseling activities emphasize the spoken word. The former is scientific and "impersonal"; the latter is humanistic and interpersonal. With the notable exceptions of some advising handbooks and student "survival guides," the grant projects were generally inattentive to the possibilities inherent in modern information technology and the economics of scale which they offer.

There is no reason why all advising needs of students must be served in one-to-one encounters. Indeed, the questions that students ask of advisors tend to have a rather limited degree of scope and complexity. To that extent, they are fairly predictable and can be more efficiently addressed through the use of printed documents, audio-visual displays, mass meetings, and computers. Greater reliance on such impersonal strategies might help alleviate the phenomenon of "advisor burnout," or advisor lethargy induced by years of answering simple, repetitive questions by thousands of students.

Comprehensive advising handbooks are one means of interpreting (and updating) college catalogs for faculty, students, and administrators. The advising projects offered a couple of excellent examples for organizing and producing such handbooks. They may be produced by a dean of undergraduate studies for general distribution, or by specific departments for use by their majors. The latter is also useful for transmitting career-related information to limited populations. Yet another approach is for advisement centers to produce "survival guides" in newspaper-type format for use by new students each semester. These offer relatively inexpensive means for reaching thousands of students through mass mailings or orientation sessions. For ideas on the structure and content of these and other audio-visual products which evolved from the grant activity, interested campuses should contact either the Chancellor's Office or the respective project directors directly.

There is no reason why all advising needs of students must be served in one-to-one encounters.

With the dramatic increase in computer capacity in the system, the decreasing cost of hardware such as terminals and printers, and the increasing sophistication and simplicity of use available in modern software packages, computer-assisted advising may offer the most efficient and dramatic reform of the advising system. This is true in two senses—as a management tool for developing better information systems to plan, control, and evaluate the advising process, and as a practical tool to assist advisors in keeping abreast of student records, degree and general education requirements, and so forth.

Unfortunately, none of the grant projects explicitly addressed the need for or potential of computers in advising, although one successful project did indicate plans to move from a system of manual transcript files on freshmen to one that was computer-based. Increasingly, the pace of technological advances in computer-assisted advising (e.g., in the form of commercially available software packages) is running far ahead of system attempts to implement and utilize them.

-
5. *Cost-Benefit Thinking*—Quality information is a valuable and expensive resource. So, too, is delivery of advising services to thousands of students each semester, even if some of the more labor-intensive methods can be eliminated. Despite the “halo” image of academic advisement, it is not immune to the fiscal and political environment within which the broader campus community operates. Accordingly, pressures toward retrenchment and demands for accountability can be expected to impact advising services along with those of the library, computer center, learning center, and the like. Career and personal counseling services are particularly susceptible targets for a host of fiscal and political reasons.

The major inherent problem of advisement is that its outcomes are largely indirect, additive, and long term. There simply is no easy way to operationalize the benefits of advising services. Still, administrative demands for quantitative data to explain and justify program effectiveness can be expected to increase.

One way of addressing this need is to limit the scope of advising activities, commit adequate resources to a few efforts, and measure them rigorously. The major goal should always be one of measuring behavioral change across time; too often the only kind of data collected measures attitudinal status at one point in time. Of course, experimental or quasi-experimental designs are always more complicated and difficult to administer than surveys but, if properly done, the quality of the data is usually superior. Despite the considerable technical, logistical, political, even ethical problems of using pre- and post-tests, and control and treatment groups, the ability to address cause-effect relationships of a behavioral nature makes the effort worthwhile, even if done on small populations. The alternatives are to guess about the effects of advising or attempt to justify it on broader, philosophical grounds; neither of these strategies is persuasive in an era of constrained resources.

6. *Advising Models*—The most popular model within which academic and other types of advising is set is student development rather than the older labels of student services or student affairs. The advising process is increasingly viewed as a multifaceted responsibility involving academic planning and evaluation, occupational and career counseling, psychological growth, moral development, and social responsibility. As such, advising becomes much more than

degree planning and course scheduling; it involves broader (and presumably related) issues of life and vocational goals. Both intellectual and interpersonal aspects of the student's total environment are addressed in an effort to serve needs beyond those of a purely academic nature—emotional, social, physical, economic, even spiritual.

The student development model of academic advising suggests rather complex organizational structures and delivery systems. Indeed, little short of total institutional integration is required if the advising process is to assume all of the roles and responsibilities which the model implies. Faculty, staff, registrars, deans, and counselors must share in a collaborative effort to communicate the requisite information and skills for student development.

The problem with the student development model is twofold: it assumes too much, and it promises too much. First, the model assumes that most students want, need, and demand all of the services it entails; yet one of the most frequent complaints among all advisors is that too few students actually use the services that are currently offered. There is ample direct and indirect evidence to show that student interest in and sense of responsibility for advising is not much greater than that of many faculty.

The problem with the student development model is twofold: it assumes too much, and it promises too much.

Another, and perhaps more dangerous, assumption of the student development model is that, if properly implemented, it can deliver on a wide range of ambitious outcomes. Students will persist and graduate, find jobs, have positive self-identities, be physically and emotionally healthy, and develop a satisfying philosophy of life. Any advising organization that promises to do any one of these things over a period of time for large numbers of students should be automatically suspect. A more realistic objective might be to partially perform one such function for a few students under certain conditions.

Moreover, it should be realized that there are limits to public financing and responsibility in higher education. It seems fair

to conclude that advisement to support the limited academic needs of students enjoys greater legal and political sanction than programs to help them become "whole persons." Students who desire broader and more specialized counseling services should be encouraged to purchase them independently of state support.

None of this suggests that broader issues (beyond courses and degrees) are not at stake in higher education; it is precisely these broader concerns which make higher education unique, interesting, and beneficial to the individual and to society. Indeed, for certain groups of students (e.g., minority and re-entry students) academic success or failure may depend heavily on whether and how competing life demands are addressed. The question is ultimately one of resources and of equity. The student development model, when applied to public institutions, requires fiscal investments in philosophical ideals rather than in scientific principles or tangible products. It may be unrealistic to expect such support. It also implies that such services should be publicly financed for the sole benefit of individuals enrolled in higher education when no other group in society is similarly benefited.

Finally, adherence to the student development model further frustrates attempts to more precisely measure and evaluate advising services. The model substitutes commitment for measurement on the assumption that high ideals and great effort will automatically produce great effects. It continues the service mentality of student services at the expense of a need for greater research orientation.

7. *Career Orientation*—The composition of the CSU student body is predominately (and increasingly) non-traditional in character—older, part time, employed, commuter, and career-oriented. Disciplines of a professional and applied nature are registering dramatic increases in majors and overall enrollment, while those with a strong academic orientation are declining. Advisement structures and services which are not congruent with the new needs and priorities of the CSU student should be reformed. The grant projects were successful in providing a strong impetus toward career advising in the system, particularly in the social and behavioral sciences. This trend deserves to be expanded to all campuses and disciplines, and present indications are that it probably will be. Sharp distinctions between academic and career advising are increasingly artificial, and advisement structures should reflect this new reality.

-
8. *Advising and Student Retention*—For fairly obvious reasons, the issues of student attrition and retention have engaged the interest of academic administrators as few others in recent years. And without question, the most popular “solution” to the problem of attrition is student advising. Too often, the assumption in higher education has been that reform of the advising system provides the most direct path to retaining more students, particularly freshmen and undeclared majors.

Almost any national survey of campus administrators on student retention shows that advising services rank at or near the top of virtually every category of attrition causes and retention strategies. Almost everyone seems to *think* that advising makes a big difference in whether students decide to stay at an institution. Indeed, such thinking has been strong enough to spawn national movements of training workshops, symposia, and publications, all based on rather loosely conceived notions about the presumed relationships between student advising and retention.

. . . the experiences with the grant projects lend additional weight to the argument that advising has relatively little to do with retention.

However, the experiences with the grant projects lend additional weight to the argument that advising has relatively little to do with retention. While it is true that a) these were small scale efforts and b) it takes time for their effects to be diffused to various classes of students, the fact remains that all of the grants hoped for more than they got on retention. Whether the focus was on faculty training, career advising, peer advisors, or special student groups, almost every proposal mentioned ties to retention and usually of a rather direct and immediate nature. Rarely was the thought entertained that advising services, much less advising grants, could and should be justified on other grounds.

Advisement directors would do well to give up chasing the ghost of retention and turn attention to more tangible and immediate outcomes of their services, and indeed more measurable ones. Advisement provides information, referrals, and various other kinds of short-term assistance—perhaps that is all that needs to be said. Whether such assistance

"adds up" to retaining students across time is difficult to measure, and most attempts to do so have not yielded strongly positive results.

For example, there tends to be little or no relationship between the size of advisement budgets or staff and student persistence rates. There is little correlation, either, between specific advisement programs and enrollment behavior. Students may persist and graduate in spite of advising services, but rarely because of them. The reason for this "no effect" tendency can be discovered by simple logic, although there is ample empirical evidence to support it as well.

Students enroll in higher education for scores of good reasons—they leave for many of the same reasons. Inadequate advisement is one among many institutional factors that may cause students to leave, and institutional factors comprise one relatively small subset of other categories of reasons for withdrawal behavior (motivational, social, economic, cultural, demographic). Once the variance is removed for such things as native ability, prior learning experiences, family background, family and work responsibilities, and so forth, the amount of explained variance available to "controllable" and institutional causes (such as advisement) is relatively small. In general, explained variance due to variables of a demographic, academic, and social nature seldom exceeds twenty-five to thirty percent. Independently, measures within each of these three sets are usually able to explain only about three to six percent.

It should come as no surprise, then, that the small star of advisement seldom produces great effects in the universe of student behavior. Administrators especially tend to expect far more of advising services than they can legitimately deliver, and for that reason alone, the simplistic linking of advisement and retention is not only technically unsound, but politically damaging to the genuine improvement of advising.

There are two important caveats to all of this. First, advising can make a difference in retention to the extent that there is regular student-faculty interaction, whether course-related, career-related, or merely informal. But such contacts must be sustained and meaningful, and it may be that the types of students most likely to seek out faculty are most likely to persist anyway. Secondly, the student involvement theory of retention is empirically persuasive. It argues that the establishment of physical, social, and psychological

commitments to and identification with the campus are powerful contributions to retention. If advising can play either a direct or indirect role in this process, it could at least be considered a background factor in retention. However, given a CSU student population that is mostly commuter, employed, older, with family and other responsibilities, it will require considerable imagination on the part of advisors to simulate such residential experiences.

9. *The Management of Advising Services*—From a professional standpoint, student advising is part of the “helping” professions. It is an activity that shares more with student services than academic teaching and research. For this and other reasons, professional literature and research into advising systems is often laden either with lyrical theories of student development, or with long checklists of communications skills which advisors should learn and adopt. Indeed, one is tempted to think that advising is little more than humanistic commitment and interpersonal skills, along with some appropriate technical information about degree requirements and courses.

But managing and delivering effective advisement services, particularly if they involve hundreds or thousands of students, require far more than either a comprehensive philosophical orientation or interpersonal skills inventory. Two critical management prerequisites for advising are resources and data, or political and analytical capabilities. Most of the deficiencies in advising of all kinds can be traced ultimately to these two factors. In that sense, advising is more a management problem, and less one of philosophy or of personality.

Most advising problems could be significantly reduced through a generous infusion of political astuteness and technical sophistication among those responsible for managing advising services. It should come as no surprise that the two most successful grant programs reviewed here (Standing and Warren) had two major things in common—an integrated network of political support, and a comprehensive information system. In short, the problems of management are the same everywhere; so, too, are the solutions.

10. *Advising Policies*—Although faculty, students, and campus administrators all agree that advising is a critical institutional function and responsibility, few policy guidelines are evident. Nationally, about two-thirds of institutions similar to the CSU

do not have published statements regarding their advising systems. Although several campuses in the CSU have made significant advances in reaching agreement on some advising principles and procedures, most do not have formalized or systematic understandings.

Still, the Academic Program Improvement grants, advising workshops, and campus advising initiatives of the past several years have served to identify the components of a successful advising program. All attempts to improve advising services or to develop advising policies should begin by realistically addressing the following issues:

- *Interest*—Perhaps as much as anything else, a simple expression of interest in student advising needs is required. Clearly, the role of the Chancellor's Office has been one of encouragement, publicity, and assistance in developing and disseminating advising programs and policies in the system.
- *Definition*—The parameters of advising services are nowhere clear. The scope could be as broad as student development or as restricted as course scheduling. A reasonable policy probably lies somewhere between these extremes since so many difficult types of issues are involved; some are philosophical, others are fiscal, and still others depend on campus organizational structures and procedures.
- *Standards and Delivery Systems*—This is at the heart of any attempt to formalize advising services, rights, and responsibilities. Campus policies should specify the minimum types and amount of advising services and information students can legitimately expect to receive, and when and by whom they will be delivered.
- *Organization*—The specific modes of advising structures are not important in themselves as long as critical functions are performed well. However, every attempt should be made to integrate advising services and to place the departmental unit and faculty advisors in the center of the system. The use of advisement centers, professional counselors, peer groups, and computers should also be considered.
- *Funding*—The amount of funding for advising will vary according to campus needs, but the sources of and authority for such funding are partly systemwide responsibilities.

-
- *Training*—To some extent, effective advising is a learned activity involving values, skills, and information which can be easily taught and disseminated. Accordingly, it is reasonable to provide for faculty, staff, and administrative training in meeting the advising needs of students.
 - *Evaluation*—This is perhaps the most difficult aspect of the advising process to implement. Any policy which mandates or encourages evaluation procedures should be informed by the considerable logistical, technical, and political problems involved.
 - *Reward*—Evaluation without reward makes little sense. It should be obvious that any reward system for advising must be both direct and tangible to be effective and, most importantly, it should become an integral part of faculty workload policy and of the personnel review process. No doubt, much of the previous dissatisfaction with faculty advising can be traced to the low priority accorded advising duties in personnel decisions.
-

No doubt, much of the previous dissatisfaction with faculty advising can be traced to the low priority accorded advising duties in personnel decisions.

- *Special Student Needs*—A taxonomy of students with special advising needs should be developed. Such students may require more specialized, often more expensive, advisement structures and services. The determination of the system (or campus) to serve those needs should be stated, together with some practical strategies and commitments for doing so.
- *Student Responsibility*—Advising is not merely a passive "right" for students. If they choose not to use certain specialized advising services in sufficient numbers, the campus should invest the resources elsewhere. The responsibilities of students to communicate their advising needs and to properly utilize advising services should be clearly understood.
- *Information Systems*—Several systemwide data bases have special relevance for student advising. The Chancellor's

Office and the Division of Information Systems should continue efforts to install and upgrade these systems on the campuses, and key individuals on the campuses (computer center directors and staff, academic planners) should seek to acquire the systems and improve dissemination of their use. A policy which does not rigorously consider the technical data requirements for effective advising (which are very great) will render many of the other concerns obsolete or unrealistic.

For additional or more detailed information on these projects, the reader should contact the Office of Academic Program Improvement, Chancellor's Office, The California State University, 400 Golden Shore, Long Beach, CA 90802-4275.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT

The division of Academic Program Improvement assists faculty in developing innovative approaches to improve both teaching and student learning through pilot projects, workshops and conferences. Since 1972, when CSU first received these funds, an estimated 150,000 students and 13,000 faculty have directly participated in one of the projects, workshops or conferences sponsored by the program. An even greater number have benefited indirectly as the effects of instructional improvements are felt by subsequent groups of students and as faculty learn from colleagues who have adopted these changes in curricula and teaching methods.

Funds are provided for faculty assigned time, clerical and student assistance, and supplies and materials not otherwise available through normal campus and departmental support. The overwhelming majority of the projects initially supported through the API office continue with support from the campus institutional budget.

Projects are selected for funding by a competitive review process in which each campus is invited to submit proposals on a variety of important topics. Review committees consist of faculty from throughout the CSU system with final decisions made by an Advisory Committee formed of representatives from faculty, administration, and students. Decisions on proposals are made on merit without reference to campus of origin.

For additional information on the API program, or on any of the projects described in this brochure, the reader should contact:

Academic Program Improvement
Office of the Chancellor
The California State University
400 Golden Shore
Long Beach, CA 90802-4275

ATSS 635-5714
(213) 590-5714

ACADEMIC PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT

Office of the Chancellor

California State University

400 Golden Shore

Long Beach, CA 90802

